

Effects of Self-Assessment on Writing of Thai EFL Students in Different Groups of Learning Styles

¹ Jakkramong Thongpai, ² Poranee Deerajviset, Ph.D.

¹ Master Degree Student, Department of English

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University, *Khon Kaen, Thailand*

² Assistant Professor, Department of English

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University, *Khon Kaen, Thailand*

E-mail: ¹ manyjack@gmail.com, ² poranee.dee@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Effective self-assessment will help language learners to objectively assess and evaluate their writing skills efficiently [1, 2]. It is also realized that the effectiveness of self-assessment of learners is affected by their learning styles [3]. As a result, the purposes of this research were: (1) to explore the preferred learning styles of Thai EFL students, (2) to examine the effects of self-assessment on writing skills of Thai EFL students in different groups of learning styles, and (3) to examine the attitudes of Thai EFL students in different groups of learning styles towards the use of self-assessment in writing. The participants of this study were 68 second year English major students who enrolled in 411232 English Essay Writing course in the second semester of the academic year 2016 at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Khon Kaen University. The research instruments consisted of 1) Felder and Soloman's (1991) Index of Learning Styles questionnaire, 2) the essay writing pretest and posttest, 3) the self-assessment checklist, 4) the attitude questionnaire, and 5) the interview. SPSS program was used to figure out the percentage, mean, standard deviation, and t-test. Content analysis was also employed to analyze the interview. The findings from Index of Learning Styles questionnaire revealed that most of students were Visual learners, followed by Global, Sensing, Active, Reflective, Intuitive, Sequential, and Verbal learners respectively. After participating in self-assessment training, all groups of students with different learning styles could get the posttest score higher than pretest. A group of students who can learn best with Reflective learning styles could get the highest different mean scores between the essay writing posttest, followed by the group of students with Global, Visual, Intuitive, Sensing, Verbal, Active, and Sequential learning styles respectively. Most of students found the self-assessment checklist useful for revising their written work which helps them to point out the strengths and the weaknesses of their own writing. They pointed out that the most useful group of items of the self-assessment checklist is organization (introduction, body, conclusion) while the most difficult group of items to self-assess is grammar and mechanics. However, comparing with self-assessment, most of students were more comfortable about getting feedback from the teacher. As a result, they suggested that self-assessment should be combined with teacher feedback.

Keywords: Learning Styles, Self-Assessment in Writing, Thai EFL Students

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing seems to be the most difficult skill for EFL learners to acquire in academic contexts [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. It is obviously seen that a number of research reveals the attempt of scholars on finding out the appropriate teaching and learning methods for learners with different background and contexts. In term of emphasizing writing skills on continual metacognition, students are required to learn to objectively assess and evaluate idea and expression in order to facilitate continual improvement of writing assignment [1, 2]. In EFL writing classroom, Oscarson [9] asserts that the positive interaction is found between students and teachers while dealing with self-assessment activities. Learner autonomy of students will be increased by realizing their own strengths and weaknesses in their own writing [10, 11, 12].

However, despite the potential benefits of self-assessment have been recognized, the effectiveness of self-assessment as a measurement tool has still been questioned by language teachers [3, 13]. The risks of using self-assessment for evaluating students' learning

outcome and grading are the obvious concern [12]. The difficulty of implementing self-assessment to a large group of students is the most obvious limitation in terms of time consuming as the teacher may be required to frequently deal with the problem on grammatical inaccuracies of the low-proficiency students in the group [14]. This should be taken into account when using self-assessment.

In addition, it is difficult for EFL students to do self-assessment as they are familiar with traditional assessment and have not much opportunity to experience self-assessment [15]. In Thailand, for example, English writing courses have been provided for Thai students to enroll in by most of the universities as both compulsory and elective courses [8]. However, the use of English is very limited in classroom in which teachers focused on dealing with marking and correcting students' writing assignments [16]. The problems of Thai EFL students when conducting self-assessment in writing include insufficient language capability, L1 interference, limitation of time, and bias which influence students to

satisfy with their first draft and believed that any change was not required [17].

Some significant research in the field of educational psychology and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has been conducted in relation to learning styles and the practice of self-assessment with regard to language skills [18]. Birjandi and Bolghari [3] also claim that the effectiveness of self-assessment of learners is affected by their learning styles. Thus, it is interesting to explore different learning styles of EFL writing learners in terms of their writing improvement towards self-assessment practice.

In Thai EFL context, even though some studies [e.g., 19, 20, 21, 22], employed the subjects of the equivalent background as well as the equivalent models of learning styles assessment, it is clearly seen that learning styles preference of different groups of students can be either similar or different. However, there are relatively small numbers of studies on learning styles of Thai EFL learners, especially studies towards writing skills improvement which are rarely found [21]. As a result, this study will try to fill this gap of research on employing the self-assessment method to EFL writing classroom in order to examine its effects on writing skills of students in different groups of learning styles. The research questions are as follows:

- What are the preferred learning styles of Thai EFL students?
- What are the effects of self-assessment on writing skills of Thai EFL students in different groups of learning styles?
- What are the attitudes of Thai EFL students in different groups of learning styles towards the use of self-assessment in writing?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Self-Assessment in Writing

Self-assessment as a formative assessment process starts when the quality of work and learning are reflected and evaluated, followed by the judgment of reflection degree based on goals or criteria, as well as indentifying strengths and weaknesses of writing before making revision if necessary [23, 24, 25]. Students can use self-assessment checklist to effectively plan the writing outline and validate their arguments through the provided evidence by realizing the weaknesses of their writing in terms of missing or lacking elements [26].

In addition to the evaluation of one's own work, self-assessment can be implemented to support the development of critical self-awareness skills of students [12]. Self-assessment can be used as a part of the entire

learning process to help learners discover their behaviors, as well as recover their previous knowledge, and increase their self-esteem and self-motivation [27]. Sahragard and Mallahi [18] added that self-assessment practice has a reflective role in the learning process and can be used while dealing with the variety of language skills. They clarified that, as for writing, this practice can refer to any method which inspires students to consider, evaluate, and respond to their own writing. Self-assessment also plays a significant role in verifying individual learning effectiveness, enhancing an inherent motivation, and promoting the preparation for life-long learning [28, 29]. Iraj, Enayat, and Momeni [28] also claimed that self-assessment can be used as a learning tool to lower anxiety of students and improve their writing skills.

Apart from the limitation of language proficiency, one of the key factors that affects either the inadequate implementation or ineffective use of self-assessment is the students have not been trained to self-assess their own writing [2, 3, 17, 30, 31, 32, 33]. For the effective implementation, many scholars [e.g., 17, 30, 31] suggest that learners should also be directly trained on how to use self-assessment approach and checklist by educating the main purpose, assessment criteria, or rating scale before the actual implementation [3].

B. Learning Styles

The term "learning styles" which is considered as another factor affecting self-assessment of learners have been discussed by scholars [e.g., 3, 18]. The interest in learning styles issue has investigated through a number of studies, proposed models, and instruments for learning styles assessment [34]. For instance, Ahmed [35] revealed that students experience some writing difficulties when they are taught regardless to their different learning styles. Fleming [36] found that students fall into more than one sensory modality of learning styles category. In this regard, Alkhatnai [37] pointed out that students' perceptions of their learning styles are affected by their personality types, cultural beliefs, and teacher's teaching styles. In terms of second language learning, Zafar and Meenakshi [38] defined learning styles as the "cognitive variations" emphasizing on the preferred way of individuals to deal with information (process, perceive, conceptualize, organize, and recall) to facilitate language learning. Learning styles are considered as the key factors for representing how and how well the learners gain knowledge of a second or foreign language [39, 40, 41].

A number of learning style models and their description have been proposed and investigated (e.g., Dunn & Dunn 1975, 1989, 1982; Fleming, 2001; Kolb, 1976, 1985, 1999; Reid, 1987; Willing, 1988). Some models have become exceptionally influential and well-known, e.g., the Dunn, Dunn and Price's Learning Styles

Inventory is used in the US, while both Kolb's Learning Style Inventory and Honey and Mumford's Learning Styles Questionnaire are widely known and used in the UK [11]. Measurement or criteria of any learning style model is presented through its inventory, or checklist, or questionnaire as a key instrument or a part of methodology for learning style assessment. Some instruments are concise and easy to use particularly in written or computer format such as Felder and Soloman's (1991) Index of Learning Styles or ILS [42, 43] which based on Felder-Silverman's (1988) learning styles model of five dimensions: Processing (Active/Reflective), Perception (Sensing/Intuitive), Input (Visual/Verbal), Understanding (Sequential/Global), and Organization (Inductive/Deductive).

Felder and Spurlin [44] explain that the ILS instrument categorized learner preference into one or another of each four pairs-dimensions. *Sensing/Intuitive*: a sensing learner can be a concrete or practical thinker who relies heavily on facts and procedures, while an intuitive learner refers to an abstract or innovative thinker who relies heavily on theories and underlying meaning. *Visual/Verbal*: a visual learner prefers visual representations of presented material, while a verbal learner prefers written and spoken explanation. *Active/Reflective*: an active learner likes trying things out and enjoys working in group, while a reflective learner likes thinking thoroughly and prefers working alone or with a familiar partner. *Sequential/Global*: a sequential learner learns in small incremental steps through linear thinking process, while a global learner learns in large leaps through holistic thinking process.

Despite the fact that studies on learning style preferences of language learners in different EFL contexts through various learning style assessment tools have demonstrated the importance of this issue, the focus towards the effect on writing skills has still not been critically discussed among EFL educators [18, 21]. In this regard, it is found that some scholars [e.g., 35, 45] recommended that the composition teachers can gain a potentially valuable perspective of their students' needs by identifying their learning styles which will be beneficial for the improvement of writing skills.

As a result, this study focuses on training ELF university students the use of self-assessment checklist in writing classroom in order to examine its effects on writing skills of students in different groups of learning styles, as well as their attitudes towards using it.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants of the Study

The sampling group of this study, selected by purposive sampling technique, is 68 undergraduate

students majoring in English at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Khon Kaen University. They enrolled in 411232 English Essay Writing course in the second semester of the academic year 2016 as the second year students. Prior to taking this course, this group of students has already studied the 411231 English Sentence and Paragraph Writing course during the first semester of the same academic year. The 411231 course involves students to practice writing the sentences using basic structure of paragraph which are considered necessary for essay writing. For this study, only process essay as one among three types of essay writing of the 411232 English Essay Writing course (descriptive, narrative, process) is mainly focused.

B. Research Instruments

In this study, five research instruments are employed: (1) index of learning styles questionnaire, (2) the essay writing pretest and posttest, (3) the self-assessment checklist, (4) the attitude questionnaire, and (6) the interview.

Felder and Soloman's ILS [46] is employed as the learning style assessment tool for this study which has parallels to other well known learning style instruments but is more concise and easier to use in online format. The ILS is a free and online questionnaire with 44 items asking the respondent to choose one of two endings to a sentence in order to assess preferences on four pairs-dimensions (active/reflective, sensing/intuitive, visual/verbal, and sequential/global) of a learning style model of Felder and Silverman (1988). After answering the questions and submitting the survey (<http://www.engr.ncsu.edu/learningstyles/ilsweb.html>), the four pairs of learning preferences are reported back immediately with a set of learning style description.

The self-assessment checklist is the adapted version of Honsa's self-assessment checklist for essay writing [17], Nimehchisalem et al.'s self-assessment checklist for argumentative writing [47], and El-Koumy's self-assessment checklist for writing processes [48]. The checklist provides 25 items for considering the 6 issues of writing process essay which include the format, organization, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics, sentence structure, and fulfill the task.

For the attitude questionnaire, a set of 23 statements with 5 rating scale is adapted from the studies of Bing [49], Muñoz and Alvarez [50], and Vasu et al. [51] in order to investigate students' attitudes in terms of benefits, limitations, and suggestions towards using self-assessment method to improve their writing skills.

C. Research Procedure

This study was conducted throughout 9 weeks during the second semester of the academic year 2016. During

the first and third week, the ILS online questionnaire was introduced to the participants by the researcher through the explanation and giving examples. They were required to respond to each statement quickly without too much thought and try not to change the responses after choosing them. After being identified and described individual learning styles, all participants sent the reports to researcher. Participants were then taught about the definition and structure of process essay, as well as how to write process essay. After that, they were assigned to write the essay writing pretest on the topic “How to Prepare Yourself for the Examination” which consists of around 500 words for a 5-paragraph process essay.

In the fourth week, participants were introduced to self-assessment through a training session. This session starts by the explanation and giving examples of all items of the self-assessment checklist. During the fifth and seventh week, participants were allowed to write another two drafts of process essay using the self-assessment checklist. Some of their pieces of writing were shown and discussed among the instructor and students in class as the examples of how and how well the assessment were made based on the items in the self-assessment checklist.

After the participants completed all writing process with self-assessment in the eighth week, they were required to write the essay writing posttest on the topic “How to Get a Good Grade” in order to examine their improvement in writing. The attitude questionnaire and interview were also conducted in the ninth week in order to gain their in-depth opinions after they finish learning to use self-assessment in writing. SPSS program was used to figure out the percentage, mean, standard deviation, and t-test. Content analysis was also employed to analyze the interview.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Learning Styles of Thai EFL Students

The participants could interpret their complete ILS questionnaire by themselves using the online explanation of the scales and the implications of their own preferences through the learning styles description provided by the ILS website. The findings from ILS questionnaire, as shown in Table I, indicated that most of EFL students in this study were *visual* learners, following by *global*, *sensing*, *active*, *reflective*, *intuitive*, *sequential*, and *verbal* learners respectively. In other words, when compared the pairs of each four dimensions of learning, the majority of learners were *visual* (input), *global* (understanding), and *sensing* (perception), while the minority were *verbal* (input), *sequential* (understanding), and *intuitive* (perception). For the dimension of processing information, number of both *active* and *reflective* learners was equal. When focused on the three levels of each

learning style preference, most of the learners of each dimension were found to be in a mild or balanced level of preference except *visual* learners who had more in a moderate and strong one respectively.

TABLE I. PARTICIPANTS' LEARNING STYLE PREFERENCE

		Level Learning style preference				
Dimensions		Mild	Moderate	Strong	Total (N=68)	%
Processing	Active	23	8	3	34	50
	Reflective	21	11	2	34	50
Perception	Sensing	19	14	4	37	54.41
	Intuitive	23	7	1	31	45.59
Input	Visual	12	25	16	53	77.94
	Verbal	12	2	1	15	22.06
Understanding	Sequential	19	3	3	25	36.76
	Global	31	11	1	43	63.24

It is consistent with Wana and Boonyaparakob's study [52]. They revealed that the majority of 177 Thai EFL students in two universities were found to prefer *visual*, *sensing*, *active*, and *global* learning styles, as well as most of them were found to be a balanced level of preferences for the different types of learning styles. Moreover, this is also in line with other groups of EFL university students in other countries. For example, Hsu and Chen [53] conducted a study with 109 freshmen students in a college in Taiwan and found that, in the dimension of *visual* and *verbal*, the majority of participants were *visual* learners while *verbal* learners were with very low proportion. Their results also pointed out that most of the students belong to the balanced type in the rest three dimensions. Hsu and Chen [53] also claimed that their findings were similar to a previous couple studies emphasizing that the *visual* learning styles was the preferred way of learning, particularly for Asian students.

Interestingly, Felder and Spurlin [44] claimed that most of ILS dimensions have similarity or can be connected to other learning style models. Nevertheless, the results of implementing different learning style assessment tools are quite the same, slightly different, or completely different. Based on the online Memletics Learning Styles Inventory (Advanogy.com), Srijongjai [21] found that the experimental group of Thai EFL students presented social and aural learning styles as the key learning styles preference which followed by verbal, visual, physical, solitary, and logical styles respectively. This is quite similar to Khmakhien's study [19] which revealed a major learning style preference of Thai EFL students as the auditory learners through Reid' PLSPQ. Both studies may refer to Reid's (1995) study who found that Thai students in the sampling group preferred learning English by listening to native speakers through

lectures or audiotapes which may be more useful to improve their English skills rather than learning English alone.

However, there was a slightly different result in Phantharakphong's [20] study using VARK questionnaire. Phantharakphong investigated English learning styles of students in regard to high and low performance throughout the English for Teaching Profession course. The result indicated that majority of students had preferred kinesthetic and multimodal styles rather than read/write, auditory, and visual styles respectively. The high performance students rated themselves as same as the preference of most of students, while low performance students preferred multimodal, and kinesthetic styles rather than read/write, visual, and auditory styles. According to Fleming [36], it can be explained that kinesthetic learners in this study prefer using experience and practice to help them to learn well. This is in line with the study conducted by Tantarangsee [22] in order to explore the learning styles of university students in Bangkok. Honey and Mumford's learning styles questionnaire based on the four dominants of learners including reflectors, theorists, pragmatists, and activists was used with 1,383 students and 5 lecturers. The preference of learning styles were ranked from high to low level as follows: activists, theorists, reflectors, and pragmatists, which can be concluded that the majority of this study's population can learn best by doing.

B. Self-Assessment in Writing and Different Groups of Learning Styles

The pretest and posttest essay writing were evaluated and scored by a native English speaker, who has taught English writing courses in a university in Thailand for 6 years, using the adapted Paulus's essay scoring rubric [53]. Total score of this adapted rubric is 50 which are equally divided into 5 different aspects of writing: organization/unity, cohesion/coherence, structure, vocabulary, and mechanics. The findings revealed that mean scores of pretest and posttest of 68 students were 21.80 and 36.25 respectively as indicated in Table II.

TABLE II. PAIRED SAMPLES STATISTICS

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	21.7941	68	8.01968	.97253
	Posttest	36.2500	68	6.44697	.78181

Moreover, the positive correlation between pretest and posttest was found (.744) with statistical significance at .05 level as shown in Table III.

TABLE III. PAIRED SAMPLES CORRELATIONS

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	68	.744	.000

In conclusion, the t-test also indicated that the posttest scores were higher than pretest ($\bar{x}=14.46$) with statistical significance at .05 level as shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV. PAIRED SAMPLES TEST

Paired Differences (Pretest - Posttest)					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
			Lower	Upper			
-14.45588	5.37944	.65235	-15.75798	-13.15378	-22.160	67	.000

This can be concluded that the writing skills of this group of EFL students are improved after taking part in self-assessment training and using the self-assessment checklist as suggested by Fahimi and Rahimi [15] and other previous studies [e.g., 17, 30, 31]. In terms of comparing students' scores based on different groups of learning styles, the differences between posttest and pretest are shown in Table V.

TABLE V. PAIRED DIFFERENCE

Dimensions		Total (N=68)	Mean		
			Pretest	Posttest	Paired Difference (Posttest - Pretest)
Processing	Active	34	22.21	36.15	13.94
	Reflective	34	21.38	36.35	14.97
Perception	Sensing	37	22.92	37.32	14.40
	Intuitive	31	20.45	34.97	14.52
Input	Visual	53	21.92	36.45	14.53
	Verbal	15	21.33	35.53	14.2
Understanding	Sequential	25	23.04	36.68	13.64
	Global	43	21.07	36	14.93

The limitation of this comparison is that the number of students in each group is not the same according to individual learning style preference. Moreover, the ILS categorizes learner preference into one or another of each four pairs-dimensions. Nevertheless, it can be described from Table V that the students with *sensing* learning style showed the highest mean of posttest score (37.32) while *reflective* learners could get the highest difference of mean score between posttest and pretest (14.97). According to Felder and Spurlin [44], a sensing learner can be a concrete or practical thinker who relies heavily on facts and procedures, while a reflective learner likes thinking thoroughly and prefers working alone or with a familiar partner. Thus, this result may be in line with the characteristics of process essay and self-assessment checklist used in this research in which the "procedure" and "self-assessment" is the key factor of each of them.

Table V also indicated that the second highest mean of posttest score was found with *sequential* learners (36.68), followed by *visual* (36.45), *reflective* (36.35), *active* (36.15), *global* (36), *verbal* (35.53), and *intuitive* learners (34.97) respectively. The second highest difference of mean score between posttest and pretest was found with *global* learners (14.93), followed by *visual* (14.53), *intuitive* (14.52), *sensing* (14.40), *verbal* (14.20), *active* (13.94), and *sequential* learners (13.64) respectively.

Interestingly, focusing on the *sequential* learners who had the second highest mean of posttest score in this study, they also got the highest mean of pretest score as well. On the contrary, they could get the lowest difference of mean score between posttest and pretest. As *sequential* learner learns best in small incremental steps through linear thinking process [44], it can be implied that *sequential* learners in this study are initially the best at self-assessing their process essay writing comparing with other learning styles. Although the implementation of step by step self-assessment checklist could significantly improve their writing skills, the proportion of improvement was lower than all groups of other learning styles, particularly when compared with *global* learners of the same dimension of understanding information which represented the highest paired difference between posttest and pretest.

Another interesting result can be obviously seen with the dimension of information input in which the largest and smallest number of learners' learning styles was found with *visual* and *verbal* respectively. Felder and Spurlin [44] pointed out that a *visual* learner prefers visual representations of presented material while a *verbal* learner prefers written and spoken explanation. However, the *visual* learners in this study can use the self-assessment checklist on writing better than verbal learners.

C. Students' Attitudes towards Self-Assessment Checklist

The attitude questionnaire was conducted with all participants of this study. Among 23 statements of attitude questionnaire, the "very high" level or "strongly agree" of attitudes were found with only two statements including "*I think self-assessment should be combined with teacher feedback*" and "*I think self-assessment can help me to point out the strengths and the weaknesses of my own writing*" with the mean score at 4.72 and 4.63 respectively.

Students also indicated that the most useful group of items of the self-assessment checklist is the organization ($\bar{X} = 4.26$) which consisted of the suggestion on rechecking the necessary issues of composing effective process essay throughout its writing structure of introduction, body, and conclusion. In addition, it could

be presumed that the most difficult group of items to self-assess is grammar and mechanics. However, most of students thought that the self-assessment checklist could help them revising their written works ($\bar{X} = 4.34$) so that they will keep using self-assessment in improving their writing ($\bar{X} = 4.21$).

Some students left a comment about self-assessment in writing, for example;

"I think self-assessment is useful to check whether the essay is complete or there still be something to add. But it cannot check that the essay is right or point out where the mistakes are because the one who check is the same person who writes it, so I think self-assessment should be combined with feedback in order to make it more effective."

"I do not know that the writing of mine is right or wrong. I always think that it is perfect."

The interview was made with some learners of strong level and moderate level of each learning style preference. All of the interviewee with all learning styles agreed that the self-assessment checklist is very effective in terms of the items which cover all necessary issues for process essay writing. They also pointed that it had affected their writing skills, especially help checking the completeness of sentences, grammatical and mechanic errors.

Students with reflective learning styles who could have the highest mean of posttest score proposed that the self-assessment checklist should not be used alone due to the limitation of their English proficiency. They emphasized that it must be used with teacher feedback. However, they believed that the reflective learning styles matching to the style they really think they are. For example, they like thinking thoroughly and prefer working alone. Some students with sequential learning styles suggested that the self-assessment checklist should be added by more grammatical features.

V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLEMENTATION

It is obviously evident from this study that the self-assessment checklist and self-assessment training can significantly improve students' writing. Most of them insist to keep using self-assessment for their further writing even though some of them are not sure about their own English proficiency and some of them require teacher feedback to help them on using it more effectively.

Among the four pairs-dimensions of Felder and Soloman's ILS [46], students with *reflective* learning style preference can be the best learner on self-assessing

and improving their process essay writing, while the proportion of improvement of students with *sequential* learning styles is lower than all groups of other learning styles even though the *sequential* learners is initially the best one in process essay writing.

According to [46], though a balance of the pairs of each dimension is desirable, very little visual information is presented in most college classes: students are mainly involved in verbal information by listening to lectures and reading material written on chalkboards and in textbooks and handouts, as well as many college lecture classes are aimed at intuitive learner, and most college courses are taught in a sequential manner. As the most of participants in this study were *visual* learners, following by *global*, *sensing*, *active*, *reflective*, *intuitive*, *sequential*, and *verbal* learners respectively, these can be presumed that the learning style preferences of most of Thai EFL university students in this study are not quite suitable for connecting to the situation or context which they can learn best.

Students' learning styles can be a fundamental of understanding and planning the lessons for not only teachers who have to identify which styles students prefer, but also for students to gain benefit from strengths and improve weaknesses after recognizing their individual learning styles [54]. Learners may prefer their own learning methods, so that they can comfortably use them to gain knowledge [55]. In addition, it is important for teachers to know their learners' preferred learning styles in order to help them to plan their lessons to match or adapt their teaching and to provide the most appropriate and meaningful activities or tasks to suit a particular learner group [35, 56].

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Kostons, T.V. Gog, and F. Paas, "Training self-assessment and task-selection skills: a cognitive approach to improving self-regulated learning," in *Learning and Instruction*, vol. 22, 2012, pp.121-132.
- [2] K. J. Nielsen, "Peer evaluation and self assessment: A comparative study of the effectiveness of two complex methods of writing instruction in six sections of composition," 2011, Doctoral dissertation, Boston University
- [3] P. Birjandi and M.S. Bolghari, "The relationship between the accuracy of self-and peer-assessment of Iranian intermediate EFL learners and their learning styles," in *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol.5 no. 5, 2015,pp. 996-1006.
- [4] K. Barkaoui, "Teaching writing to second language learners: Insights from theory and research," in *TESL Reporter*, vol.40 no.1, 2007, pp. 35-48.
- [5] Y. Kim and J. Kim, "Teaching Korean university writing class: balancing the process and the genre approach," in *ASEAN EFL Journal*, vol.7 no.2, 2005, pp. 69-90.
- [6] G. M. Negari, "A study on strategy instruction and EFL learners' writing skill," in *International Journal of English Linguistics*, vo.1 no.2, 2011, pp. 299-307.
- [7] J.C. Richards and W.A. Renandya, *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [8] S. Watcharapunyawong and S. Usaha, "Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: the interference of the first language," in *English Language Teaching*, vol.6 no.1, 2013. pp. 67-78.
- [9] A.N. Oscarson, *Self-assessment of writing in learning English as a foreign language: a study at the upper secondary school level*, Göteborg Studies in Educational Sciences 277. Göteborg: Geson Hylte Tryck, 2009.
- [10] V. Badrinathan, "Self-assessment and learner autonomy: challenges in foreign language teaching in India," in *Third 21st CAF Conference at Harvard*, in Boston, USA, vol.6 no.1, 2015, pp. 66-73.
- [11] F.Coffield, D. Moseley, E. Hall, and K. Ecclestone, *Learning styles and pedagogy in post-16 learning: a systematic and critical review*. London: Learning and Skills Research Centre, 2004.
- [12] M. Y. Omelicheva, "Self and peer evaluation in undergraduate education: structuring conditions that maximize its promises and minimize the perils," in *Journal of Political Science Education*, vol.1 no.2, 2005, pp. 191-205.
- [13] A. Muth'im, "Does student self-assessment assess as valid and reliable as teacher assessment?," in *Arab World English Journal*, vol.7 no.1, 2016, pp. 123 -139.
- [14] Y. Li and L. Chen, "Peer- and self-assessment: A case study to improve the students' learning ability," in *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol.7 no.4, 2016, pp. 780-787.
- [15] Z. Fahimi and A. Rahimi, "On the impact of self-assessment practice on writing skill," in *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol.192, 2015, pp. 730- 736.
- [16] S. Tangkiengsirisin and K. Rusma, "**Thai** students' perceptions on the direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: a **Thai** university context," in *Arab World English Journal*, vol.7 no.3, 2016, pp. 161-176.
- [17] S. Honsa, "Self-assessment in EFL writing: a study of intermediate EFL students at a Thai university," in *Voice in Asia Journal*, vol.1 no.1, 2013, pp. 34-57.
- [18] R. Sahragard and O. Mallahi, "Relationship between Iranian EFL learners' language learning styles, writing proficiency and self-assessment," in *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol.98, 2014, pp.1611-1620.
- [19] A. Khmakhien, "Demystifying Thai EFL learners' perceptual learning style preferences," in *3L: The*

- Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, vol.18 no.1, 2012, pp.61-74.
- [20] P. Phantharakphong, "English learning styles of high and low performance students of the Faculty of Education, Khon Kaen University," in *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol.46, 2012), pp. 3390-3394.
- [21] A. Srijongjai, "Learning styles of language learners in an EFL writing class," in *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol.29, 2011), pp. 1555-1560.
- [22] C. Tantarangsee, "Learning styles of university students in Bangkok: The characteristics and the relevant instructional context," in *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, vol.7 no.1, 2013, pp. 135-142.
- [23] H.L.Andrade and Y. Du, "Student responses to criteria-referenced self-assessment," in *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol.32 no.2, 2007, pp. 159-181.
- [24] C. Joyce, L. Spiller, and J. Twist, "Self-assessment: what teachers think?," in *New Zealand Council for Educational Research*, <<http://www.nzcer.org.nz/pdfs/self-assessment.pdf>>; 2009 [accessed 28.12.16]
- [25] J. H. McMillan and J. Hearn, "Student self-assessment: the key to stronger student motivation and higher achievement," in *Educational Horizons*, vol.87 no.1, 2008, pp. 40-49.
- [26] Y. M. Fung and H. C. Mei, "Improving undergraduates' argumentative group essay writing through self-assessment," in *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, vol.6 no.5, 2015, pp. 214-224.
- [27] J. Naeni, "Self-assessment and the impact on language skills," in *Educational Research*, vol. 2 no. 6, 2011, pp.1225-1231.
- [28] H. R. Iraj, M. J. Enayat, and M. Momeni, "The Effects of self- and peer-assessment on Iranian EFL learners' argumentative writing performance," in *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol.6 no.4, 2016, pp. 716-722.
- [29] C. Steinkruger, "Do students' progress if they self-assess? A study in small-group work," in *University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Math in the middle institute partnership*, <<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/mathmidactionresearch/27>>; 2007 [accessed 12.12.16]
- [30] S. Cho, "Alignment of self-assessment and peer-assessment with teacher-assessment in a university EFL writing classroom," in *Korea Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, vol.14 no.1, 2014, pp.125-147.
- [31] L. S. Lopes, "Alternative assessment of writing in learning English as a foreign language: analytical scoring and self-assessment," in *Bridgewater State University: Master's Theses and Projects*, <<http://vc.bridgew.edu/theses/13>>; 2015 [accessed 20.12.16]
- [32] D. Spiller, *Assessment Matters: Self-Assessment and Peer Assessment*, Waikato: The University of Waikato, 2012.
- [33] B.M. Warne, "Writing steps: A recursive and individual experience," in *English Journal*, vol.97 no.5, 2008, pp. 23-27.
- [34] S. Inal, O. Büyükyavuz, and M. Tekin, "A study on preferred learning styles of Turkish EFL teacher trainees," in *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, vol.40, no.3, 2015, pp. 52-67.
- [35] O. N. Ahmed, "The effect of different learning styles on developing writing skills of EFL Saudi learners," in *British Journal of Art and Social Sciences*, vol.5 no.2, 2012, pp. 220-233.
- [36] N.D. Fleming, *Teaching and learning styles: VARK strategies*, Christchurch, New Zealand: N.D. Fleming, 2001.
- [37] M. Alkhatnai, "Learning styles of EFL Saudi college-level students in on-line and traditional educational environments," <<http://search.proquest.com/docview/867369322?accountid=27797>>; 2011 [accessed 12.01.17]
- [38] S. Zafar and K. Meenakshi, "Individual learner differences and second language acquisition: a review," in *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol.3 no.4, 2012, pp. 639-646,
- [39] N. Bayatpour, M. Rostampour, and S.J. Abdorahimzade, "L2 writing ability in two various genres and EFL learners' learning styles and patterns of strategy use," in *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, vol.6 no.4, 2014, pp. 410-425.
- [40] Z. Jafarpanah and M. Farahian, "The relationship between learning styles and metacognitive reading strategy of EFL learners," in *International Research in Education*, vol.4 no.1, 2016, pp. 47-55.
- [41] R.L. Oxford, *Language learning styles and strategies*, In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second language*, Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2001, pp. 359-366.
- [42] S. Graf, S. R.Viola, T. Leo, and Kinshuk, "In-depth analysis of the Felder-Silverman learning style dimensions," *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, vol.40 no.1, 2007, pp. 79-93.
- [43] C. W. Hsu and S. C. Chen, "A Study of EFL college students' learning styles and learning strategies," in *Journal of Modern Education Review*, vol.6 no.1, 2016, pp.1-9.
- [44] R. M. Felder and J. Spurlin, "Applications, reliability and validity of the index of learning styles," in *International Journal of Engineering Education*, vol.21 no.1, 2005, pp. 103-112.

- [45] N. B. Jones, "Applying learning styles research to improve writing processes," Paper presented at the Malaysian International Conference on English Language Teaching, Rasa Sayang, Penang, Malaysia, on May 21, 1996.
- [46] R.M. Felder and B.A. Soloman, "Index of Learning Styles," North Carolina State University, <<https://www.engr.ncsu.edu/learningstyles/ilsweb.html>>; 1991 [accessed 11.11.16]
- [47] V. Nimehchisalem, D. Y. S. Chye, S. Kaur, P. J. Singh, S. Z. Zainuddin, S. Norouzi, and S. Khalid, "A self-assessment checklist for undergraduate students' argumentative writing," in *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, vol.5 no.1, 2014, pp. 65-80.
- [48] A.S.A. El-Koumy, "Effect of Self-assessment of writing processes versus products on EFL students' writing," Paper presented at the Tenth EFL Skills Conference, the American University in Cairo, Center for Adult and Continuing Education, on Jan 12-14, 2004.
- [49] X. U. Bing, "A study of the effects of student self-assessment on the EFL writing of Chinese college students," in *Journalism*, vol.6 no.2, 2016, pp. 91-107.
- [50] A. Muñoz and M. E. Alvarez, "Students' objectivity and perception of self-assessment in an EFL classroom," in *Journal of Asia TEFL*, vol.4 no.2, 2007, pp. 1-25.
- [51] K. Vasu, C. H. Ling, and V. Nimehchisalem, "Malaysian tertiary level ESL students' perceptions toward teacher feedback, peer feedback and self-assessment in their writing," in *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, vol.5 no.5, 2016, pp.158-170.
- [52] W. Wana and K. Boonyaparakob, "Thai EFL learners' learning style preferences in Thai university contexts," in *Veridian E-Journal*, vol.7 no.5, 2014, pp. 178-191.
- [53] T. M. Paulus, "The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing," in *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol.8 no.3, 1999, pp. 265–289.
- [54] Y. Hou, "An investigation of perceptual learning style preferences, language learning strategy use, and English achievement: A case study of Taiwanese EFL students," <<http://search.proquest.com/docview/305138882?accountid=27797>>; 2009.
- [55] J. Muniandy, and M. Shuib, "Learning styles, language learning strategies and fields of study," in *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, vol.12 no.1, 2016, pp. 1-19.
- [56] M. Zhou, "Learning styles and teaching styles in college English teaching," in *International Education Studies*, vol. 4 no.1, 2011, pp. 73-77.